



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,346	12/07/2001	Jean-Luc Legoupil	103120-00028	7855

4372 7590 08/14/2003

ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN
1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 400
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

KASTLER, SCOTT R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1742

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/005,346

Applicant(s)

LEGOUPIL, JEAN-LUC

Examiner

Scott Kastler

Art Unit

1742

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-27, 31-35 and 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 28-30, 36-38 and 40-50 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract should be in the form of a single paragraph of no more than 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The above claim is indefinite because it recites that the operating mode include a 'skin pass'. It is not clear from the claims what exactly is intended to be covered by the term "skin pass", so the scope of the claims is unascertainable to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 24-27 and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European '874. European '874 teaches a plant for producing a metal band with at least one protection layer including a supply section (1-8), a first metal coating section including a lower entry into a molten metal bath (9) and a vertical rising section including cooling (101), an

Art Unit: 1742

intermediate, or complementary treatment section (14, 15) including a skin pass mill, and leading into a second coating section (16, 17) including a coating means and a drying section, and finally ending in an exit section (18-21) including an accumulator, thereby showing all aspects of the above claims except the specific recited component locations or arrangements (the configuration of the band paths of the dependent claims for example), although the plant of European'874 is stated to perform substantially the same function (coating of a metal band with at least two coating layers) in substantially the same manner (by guiding a metal band through a plurality of coating baths, cooling and drying sections) with substantially the same stated results (improved coating in a compact plant arrangement). It has been well settled that where the applied prior art teaches the claimed components of a claimed apparatus, and the prior art apparatus performs substantially the same function in substantially the same manner with substantially the same results as a claimed apparatus, motivation to alter the shape or location of components shown by the applied prior art without materially altering the functions of these components, would have been modifications obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. See *In re Dailey*, 149 USPQ 47, MPEP 2114.04 IV B (changing the shape of a component) and *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70, MPEP 2144.04 VI C (changing the location or orientation of a component). In the instant case, since the plant arrangement of European'874 employs all of the instantly recited components in order to perform substantially the same process with substantially the same results, motivation to alter the shape or location of the components recited by European'874 (specifically the orientation or location of the path followed by the metal band through the plant) without significantly altering the function of the plant of European'874 would

Art Unit: 1742

have been a modification obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 28-30, 36-38 and 40-50 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 39 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Each of Hunter et al, and Gordon et al are also cited as further examples of prior art band treatment plants.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Kastler whose telephone number is (703) 308-2506. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (703) 308-3050. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 1742

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.



Scott Kastler
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1742

sk
August 7, 2003